DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 978 JC 930 132

AUTHOR	Caldwell, Patricia F.
TITLE	Communication/Culture Study for Victor Valley College, Victorville, California, November 1991-April 1992.
INSTITUTION	Victor Valley Community Coll. District, Victorville, CA.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	58p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Change; *Change Strategies; College Administration; *College Environment; College Presidents; Communication Audits; Community Colleges; Group Dynamics; Institutional Research; *Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; *Organizational Communication; Organizational Development; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Victor Valley College CA

ABSTRACT

In November 1991, a study was conducted to assess the corporate culture and state of communication at Victor Valley College (VVC), in Victorville, California. The study was designed to determine the extent to which "trust" or "distrust" existed at VVC, and whether the lack of communication on campus was real or perceived. Study methodology involved individual and group interviews, observations from meetings, the administration of two assessment instruments, and a review of meeting minutes, policies, and other documents. Conclusions emanating from the 5-month study included the following: (1) the president's management style was closer to autocratic than participative, although he was working to change this; (2) there was significant confusion over the roles of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Association, with current leadership styles of the two groups fostering territorialism and adversarial relations with management; (3) lack of communication between departments and divisions and adversarial attitudes between classified and certificated staff contributed to a weak culture; (4) there was no shared vision of VVC's future direction, with the staff and faculty often failing to realize their important role in shaping that vision; (5) administrators were perceived as spending too little time out among employees; (6) the filtering or blocking of information flow occurred both upwards and downwards, and occasionally by design; (7) verbal communication took place primarily in meetings, and then usually as information sharing rather than discussion; and (8) outside of meetings, there was a heavy reliance on written communication. Suggestions for improving the campus climate are given. Appendixes include the survey instrument and verbatim responses. (MAB)

ED355978

COMMUNICATION/CULTURE STUDY

FOR

VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE
VICTORVILLE, CALIFORNIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. F. Caldwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared by:

Patricia F. Caldwell, Ph.D.
Management Consultant

November 1991 - April 1992

JC930132

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OUTLINE OF REPORT

I. Purpose

II. Method

III. Findings

A. Surveys
B. Interviews/Small Group Discussions
C. Observations at Meetings
D. Significant Events and Culture

IV. Conclusions

V. Recommendations

VI. Suggestions for Accomplishing Recommendations

VII. Concluding Comments

VIII. Appendices

I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In November 1991, a study was undertaken to assess the "Corporate Culture" and the state of the communications systems at Victor Valley College. The study was designed to determine the extent to which "trust" or "distrust" exist in the organization as well as whether or not "the lack of communication" on campus is *real* or *perceived.* These issues were raised at the Highland Springs staff retreat in the Spring of 1991 and also during the management retreats the same summer. The desired ultimate outcome of the study was to utilize the information gained from the research to improve both communication and teamwork.

II. METHOD

The study was undertaken utilizing a variety of methods: individual interviews, observations at meetings, the administration of two assessment instruments, and a review of meeting minutes, policies and other documents.

Originally it was anticipated that the consultant would use the ethnographic field study method of researcher-observer. However, as the study progressed and administration and staff felt more comfortable with the consultant, she found herself assuming the role of participant-observer. This is due to the fact that she was asked to facilitate two planning days for faculty and staff and was able to observe while participating in a role separate from, but concurrent with, that of researcher.

A. **Individual interviews:**
Twenty-five faculty and staff members were randomly selected to be interviewed. Of the twenty-five individuals who were contacted, twenty-two agreed to be interviewed. The average length interview was thirty minutes, although a few were as long as one and one-half hours. Only two of those interviewed felt they had "nothing to say" or to contribute.

In addition to those faculty and staff members who were randomly selected, the consultant also interviewed certain "key informants." Key informants included the President, the three Vice-Presidents, the Personnel Director, the Public Information Director and the Faculty Senate/ Association President.

Additionally, all but one of the members of the Board of Trustees were interviewed.

B. **Small-group discussions:**
The consultant met with the Faculty Senate/Association Executive Council, the CSEA Executive Committee, the ASB Officers and the Women's Support Group.

C. **Observations at meetings:**
The consultant "sat in" on or acted as a participant-observer in eighteen different meetings during the course of the study. Observations were conducted at meetings of the following:

1) President's Staff (3X)
2) President/ASB Officers
3) Fireside Chat (2X)
4) College Assembly (2X)
5) Curriculum Committee

6) Managers
7) Accreditation Steering Committee
8) Instructional Administrators (2X)
9) Academic Senate Executive Council
10) Standard One (Accreditation) Committee (Participant-Observer)
11) A Dean's Meeting with Department Chairs
12) Faculty Flex-Day (Participant-Observer)
13) Staff Flex-Day (Participant-Observer)

D. **Surveys:**

Two surveys were administered as part of the study. The first was the Organization Communications Analysis (OCA) which was given to all faculty and staff members. The consultant had not used this survey before and, in retrospect, wishes she hadn't used it this time. The instrument was of poor quality, prompting negative reactions from some of those who completed it. It was used only because the consultant had promised that everyone would have an opportunity for input to the study through a survey and there was not time to return it or construct a different survey. Despite its poor quality, the instrument did yield some usable data which is reported later. Fifty nine out of 181 (31%) returned completed surveys.

The second survey, the Group Communication Assessment (GCA) was much more productive in terms of results and prompted a much more favorable reaction from those who were asked to complete it. Sixty faculty and staff members were chosen at random to receive the survey, and thirty actually returned completed surveys (50%).

E. **Review of written communications:**

The consultant asked for and received a mailbox so that she could receive the same all-campus communications that the rest of the staff receive. She also asked for and received copies of many other documents, among them the following:

1) *Victor Valley College Marketing Plan*
2) *An Employer's Guide to Working With Victor Valley College*
3) *Affirmative Action Handbook*
4) "A Proposed Code of Ethics for Participants in Shared Governance"
5) "The Challenge of 1991-President's Remarks to the Faculty and Staff of Victor Valley College"
6) "Shared Governance Task Force Committee Report"
7) "Encouraging Greater Student Participation in Governance"
8) "Strengthening Academic Senate Regulations"
9) "Shared Governance-What Did the Legislature Intend When it Adopted AB1725 or Who Is Making Decisions Around Here, Anyway?"
10) "AB1725 - Comprehensive Analysis
11) Assembly Bill No. 1725
12) A copy of a listing of Faculty Senate Committees 1991-1992
13) A copy of a memorandum outlining differences in Faculty Senate and Faculty Association responsibilities
14) Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws
15) Faculty Association Constitution and By-laws
16) A copy of a memorandum entitled "Formal Communication Review"

17) *Educational Master Plan*
18) *Rams Bookstore: Everything You Wanted To Know But Were Afraid To Ask*

The methods outlined above were selected to provide both objective and subjective data. The subjective data included information about attitudes, beliefs, opinions and perceptions of the employees regarding the organizational culture and its communications networks.

III. FINDINGS

A. Analysis of Surveys:

1) Organization and Communication Analysis (OGA)

a. Description

Checklist and open-ended questions. Employee perceptions of internal and external communications systems. Perceptions of the organization's image. Suggestions for improvement.

b. Summary Analysis

All full-time certificated and classified staff were invited to complete the survey. Fifty nine surveys were returned.

In communicating with the "outside," staff utilized traditional systems: letters, telephone, publications/reports, networking and field visits. They were less likely to take a "marketing/PR" approach (perhaps because the college is "over CAP"). Very few of them indicated a use of advertising, mass media or press releases. Only four respondents indicated an awareness of "tele-conferencing" as a method of communication.

In internal communication, a variety of traditional methods and systems were also utilized. Most respondents relied on formal methods to get their information, primarily through the written word. Letters, forms, memos, reports, signs, posters, and bulletin boards, all received high responses. Likewise, the use of the spoken word was relied upon as a method of formal communications (although not quite as heavily as the written word): telephone conversations, visits to each others' offices and meetings of departments, task forces and committees.

Communication also was accomplished in informal ways, although respondents tended to rely more heavily on the formal methods. Respondents tended to communicate through their informal relationships and networking with peers, students and their employee unions. About forty percent stated they used the "grapevine" as a communication tool.

In responding to the questions regarding the "image" of the *college*, about one-third of the respondents thought Victor Valley College had a negative image in the community. Seven others thought that while the image on the "outside" might be positive, persons on the "inside" had negative feelings about the organization. Reasons given for a negative image included such comments as "not up-to-date," "unprofessional," "amateurish," "fragmented," "no clear direction," "very little communication from the top down," and "lack of trust."

On the other hand, about two-thirds of the respondents believed the college has a positive image in the community. Comments such as "professional," "dynamic," excellent reputation," "student-oriented," "well organized," "fine programs and faculty" were used frequently.

When asked to describe their *department's* "image," only seven respondents attributed a negative image to their department. Most respondents saw their departments in a positive light. Many saw their departments as "short-handed," "overworked," "struggling to keep up," but always "getting the job done."

When asked how other departments might view the respondent's department, about one-third believed other departments might view them negatively. Comments such as others might see us as "lacking cohesiveness," "tight," "formal," "cold," "impersonal," "rigid," "unbending" and "nit-pickers" were common.

On the other hand, two-thirds believed other departments would view their department positively. These respondents used words like "competent," "hard-working," "appreciative," "cohesive," "helpful" and "friendly" to describe their department's image within the college.

When asked what could be done to project a better image to other departments, the following were typical suggestions:

- "more clear cut organization"
- "have a reputable manager"
- "better staffing"
- "follow through on commitments"
- "less hostile department chairs"
- "reduce dependence on voice mail"
- "have more positive attitude"
- "have less administrative arrogance, bias, threats, prejudice"

The next part of the survey addressed the flow of communications on campus--downward, upward, and circular. This part of the survey proved to be confusing to most of the respondents and quite a few ignored it. Some responses were not usable because they indicated a lack of understanding. Of those usable responses, many indicated that little communication flowed downward to them from above except for daily work assignments from supervisors. These directives came both verbally and written. About half of the respondents indicated a lack of communication downward by using terms such as "rarely," "very little to none," "not much," "never" and "there is none."

As for information flowing upward from "line workers" to administration, respondents indicated a pattern of communicating with immediate supervisors but little opportunity to communicate with higher level administrators. When information flows upward, it is delivered in a "tense, careful, cautious" way, "sometimes not to my benefit." Respondents indicated that while they desired responses to their upward communications, responses were rarely received.

"Circular" communication can be defined as "up, down and across;" i.e., it knows no boundaries and everyone feels free to communicate with everyone else. It was obvious from the responses that most of the staff members who returned surveys were not familiar with this definition. Those who were described circular communication as taking place primarily in staff meetings within their departments. Some, however, said "not much of this goes on," or "administration blocks this open communication," or "infrequent outside our department."

Perhaps the most informative and revealing portion of the survey was the section where respondents were asked to make suggestions for improving communications. Almost everyone responded with suggestions, some of them lengthy. Responses tended to fall into three categories: 1) the need for "more," "better," and "timely" information; 2) the need to decrease territorialism and the number of factions on campus; and 3) the need for "administration" to make changes in the way it communicates from the President all the way down through line supervisors. As the responses were lengthy, the reader is referred to Appendix A for the complete text. However, a few observations seem appropriate here: 1) Staff members see a need for the President and other administrators to get out of their offices more so they can communicate on staff's "turf;" 2) Staff is frustrated by a perceived lack of action taken on their recommendations (or a lack of communication regarding actions taken); 3) Staff feels the need for *all* members of the campus community to have a clearer understanding of and agreement regarding the definition of, participative management.

2) Group Communication Assessment (GCA)

a. *Description*

GCA is a two-party 30 item instrument with a Likert type response scale. Part A consists of 20 items that measure employees' perception about the quality of group communication with respect to timeliness, accuracy, openness, honesty, candor, relevancy, meaningfulness and trustfulness. Part B consists of 10 items that focus on key group process behaviors that affect the quality of communication within the group.

b. *Summary Analysis*

Of the sixty employees randomly selected to receive the GCA, thirty returned completed surveys. These surveys confirmed the findings of the OCA distributed earlier to the entire staff. (See Appendix B for a tally of GCA responses.)

For the most part, the employees felt that the information they received was relevant and meaningful. This set of items received an average score of 3.32 out of a possible 4.0 points. However, while the ***actual information received*** may have been meaningful, employees doubt that they are receiving ***all*** the information they ***should*** receive. This is evidenced by low average scores on the sets related to "accuracy, sufficiency and timeliness of information received" (2.59) and "candor, honesty and openness" (2.5). The three items receiving the lowest scores in the entire survey dealt with this issue. Item 16 read, "There are very few secrets among the members of the group" and received the lowest score on the survey--a 2.17 out of a possible 4.0. Item 18 read, "It is unusual for us to have a problem

with the accuracy and timeliness of the information that we obtain" and received a 2.3 out of possible 4.0. Following close behind was Item 20, "The members of our group feel free to discuss group task related issues in an open, honest and candid way" (2.38 out of 4.0).

There appears to be a feeling among employees that they do not receive enough information and that information may be withheld from them. This belief would naturally lead employees to state that there might be "secrets" kept from them and that others are not being open, honest and candid. The set of items relating to candor received the lowest average set score of the five sets--a 2.5 out of 4.0.

Additionally, it appears as though trust and respect and behaviors supporting those conditions are somewhat lacking. The set relating to trust received a 2.7 out of 4.0. The set measuring supportive behaviors received a 2.84 out of 4.0. Item 7, "There is a great deal of trust among the members of our group" received a score of 2.41 out of 4.0 with sixteen of the twenty-nine respondents disagreeing with that statement. (One person did not answer this item.) The other item in the "trust set" receiving a fairly low score was Item 19, "We seldom have unconstructive bickering and conflict within our group." This item received a 2.6 out of 4.0. Related to the "conflict item" was an item in the "supportive behaviors" set, Item 27, which read, "If conflict arises in the group, we all do what we can to help resolve it." That item received a 2.65 out of 4.0 with approximately half the group responding in agreement and the other half in disagreement.

Overall, the thirty respondents rated the quality of communications at Victor Valley College as "fair," giving it a 55.57 points out of a possible 80. The group also rated the employees' ability to use good interpersonal communication skills and supportive behaviors as "fair," giving those items an average score of 28.46 out of a possible 40.

The score for all sets tallied as follows:

Set A (Relevancy, meaningfulness)	3.32 out of 4.0
Set B (Accuracy, sufficiency, timeliness)	2.59 out of 4.0
Set C (Trust and respect)	2.70 out of 4.0
Set D (Candor, honesty, openness)	2.50 out of 4.0
Set E (Supportive behaviors)	2.84 out of 4.0

Scoring Key

	Part A (Sets A-D)	Part B (Set E)	VVC's Part A	VVC's Part B
Very Good	70-80	35-40		
Good	60-70	30-35		
Fair	50-60	25-30	55.57	28.46
Poor	Below 50	Below 25		

B. **Interviews and Small Group Discussions**

1) President's Management Style

Probably the most significant piece of data gleaned from the fifty-six pages of notes taken during this study relates to the management style of the college President. Of the many people the consultant spoke with, only one indicated intense dislike for the President. That individual had, in essence, dismissed the possibility that the President has any talent for or potential in the job of Chief Administrative Officer of the institution. Without exception, all others indicated that the current President is talented and visionary and has a great deal of potential. The following are examples of typical comments: "He's got a long way to go, but he's still the best President I've ever worked for"; "He's still learning, but he has the potential to be a great President"; and, "He's doing a good job, but he needs to slow down."

While employees were quick to voice positive remarks about the President, they were just as quick to offer constructive criticism. The general feeling among employees, from the President's top administrators on through the rest of the organization is that, while he truly wants to be a participative manager, "he isn't there yet." Comments regarding his management style often pointed to the belief that the President's "tone" is often very directive, almost dictatorial, and that this immediately puts others on the defensive. The perception is that the President wants to be in control of everything and that he tends to "micro-manage." It was also pointed out by several that the President has a "temper," tends to be impulsive and makes quick decisions. These traits often cause problems for employees who begin to act upon the President's decision only to find later that the decision has been changed after he has had time to "calm down" and think more about that decision. Some individuals indicated that they have learned to work with this situation and have learned not to act for a few days anticipating that the President will change his mind. However, others find the situation to be frustrating and confusing, feel like they are getting "mixed messages," and feel these actions on the part of the President contribute to a lack of credibility and trust in their relationship with him.

In addition to the above comments, interviewees often reported that 1) they have difficulty getting in to see the President, and 2) he needs to get out of his office more and "practice a little MBWA" (Management by Wandering Around). Several also indicated that they see the President as "very intense," and that he needs to "loosen up a little and have more fun."

The significance of the data about the President is that his current management style (at least as it is perceived to be) does not lend itself to participative management or the establishment of trust and candor. However, the consultant is convinced that the President does, in fact, truly wish to be participative and that he has embarked upon a self-study program which will enable him to adjust his style as he practices new skills.

2) The second most significant body of data related to the belief that territorialism is rampant on campus. Over and over again, interviewees talked about the lack of inter-departmental communication, the lack of a "big picture" so each department or division could see where it fits into the college's vision, and the lack of direction "from the top." It was felt that, lacking a "big picture" or "vision," departments and divisions will continue to fight among themselves for resources and will continue to engage in petty bickering and jealousies. When

asked if faculty and staff discuss such concerns in departmental and division meetings, the usual response was laughter. Interviewees gave the impression that the structure of these meetings and the comments made in them tend to further the rivalry rather than bring departments together in harmonious ways.

In some instances rivalries and divisiveness appeared to be fostered by certain administrators and managers. For example, one interviewee commented that "she appreciated the support" of her Dean, but she could "do without his snide remarks about 'the administration'" and/or other divisions. (The existence of this situation was confirmed when the consultant visited a meeting of this Dean's department chairs later.)

Another interviewee informed the consultant that his perception was that even some of the President's closest aides were really only feigning support, and that when they were back in their departments they resorted to "backstabbing" and "blaming."

From interviews with some of the President's staff it became apparent that there is a concern about territorialism even at that level. One Vice-President, in particular, appears not to share much information about the activities in his area with the other Vice-Presidents, even when their areas of work might be impacted. (The President has been trying to bring the Vice-Presidents together on a weekly basis to foster cooperation among them.)

The consultant does not wish to leave the impression that all administrators and managers are seen as fostering divisiveness. Some are seen as very effective. One Dean, in particular, is seen as a "good communicator," "very supportive," "keeps us informed," "a real problem-solver." Another is seen as "very supportive," "does a good job," "is there when I need him/her." One Vice-President received almost unanimous support from those interviewed. He was described as "trying hard," "supportive," "knows what he's doing."

3) Another body of data prevalent in the study related to the belief that there is a "lack of information" on campus. This ties very closely to data revealed in the surveys. Those employees furthest removed from top administration felt that there is a "filtering" of information according to what a Vice-President, a Dean or a middle-manager believes an employee "needs to know." Many classified employees, particularly in the Student Services area, felt they only got information they needed to do the task to which they had been assigned, and that they knew very little about anything happening elsewhere on campus. This makes it very difficult for them to see how they, as individuals, are contributing to the mission of the college.

   Closely related to the "lack of information" was concern on the part of faculty for the way they receive written information--through mailboxes located in the Administration building. Many stated that they will go several days before checking their mailboxes because the location is so inconvenient. Often, by the time they get the mail from their mailboxes, much of it is old news or there is so much paper that they dump half of it in the nearest wastebasket. "There has to be a better way" was a frequent comment.

4) A fourth very significant body of data that kept appearing in interviews and small group discussions related to the confusion over the role of the Faculty Senate as compared to the

role of the Faculty Association. Several certificated interviewees made comments concerning their own decision not to become involved in either organization. The following comments were typical: "I stopped going to Senate because they never dealt with any educational issues"; "I don't want to get involved in all that fighting and backbiting"; "I don't want to get the reputation of being a rabble-rouser"; and "When will they start fighting for students instead of for themselves?"

The lack of understanding as to the role of each organization is obvious when one looks at the responses to the Faculty Survey conducted on behalf of the Faculty Senate. (See Appendix C for a complete copy of the Faculty Survey). In response to Question 1: "What do you think the role of the Faculty Senate should be?" several faculty members responded that the Senate should be "taking care of our working welfare," "protecting the rights of the faculty," "airing our grievances," "getting fair pay, health and benefits for faculty," and so forth. These responses would more typically describe the role of the Faculty Association. In interviews, when asked why the Faculty Association and Faculty Senate have the same officers, most certificated employees commented they "weren't sure," or "probably because they're really just one organization anyway."

In an interview with the Faculty Senate President, the consultant was assured that Senate and Association business are kept separate with separate meeting times, agendas and minutes. However, the consultant observed several times when issues seemed to be confused and Faculty "Senate" seemed to be taking positions on matters which were rightfully more the concern of Faculty "Association." It appears that this confusion of organizational role has carried over into and has hindered the attempt to institute "shared governance" on campus.

C. <u>Observations at Meetings</u>

1) President's meetings

In observing meetings conducted by the President, the communication flow was generally two-way, back and forth between the President and one individual at a time. Rarely was there circular communication with a lot of give and take on substantial issues. Usually agendas were long with too many items to discuss in the time allotted. Information was usually reported to the President, and, if a decision was made it was usually made by the President, not the group. Meetings were held around a long conference table with the President at the head of the table. The President conducted the meetings which tended to be quite formal. There was usually sharing of information but little in-depth discussion.

2) Instructional Meetings

The Vice-President of Instruction also held meetings around a rectangular table but rarely sat at the head of the table. In charting the flow of communication, two people dominated the discussion. One Dean asked a lot of questions and another Dean usually answered them. The third Dean seemed to speak only if something interested him personally. Other participants seldom spoke. Communication was most often circular. Again, there did not seem to be in-depth discussion of issues. Rather, there seemed to be more sharing of information and asking questions.

3) A Dean's Meeting with Department Chairs

Again, there was no in-depth discussion of substantial issues. Communication was primarily two-way between the Dean and one Department Chair at a time. The Dean tended to act in a very brisk, short manner moving quickly from one agenda item to the next. On more than one occasion, the Dean made snide remarks about other members of the administration or "administration" in general, tending to classify himself/herself more as "one of you" (the Department Chairs) than "one of them."

Discussion of one agenda item confirmed concern about territorialism raised earlier in this report. In talking about the twenty computers "owned" by this Division now in use in the Computer lab in another Division, comments such as "who owns that building anyway?" and "We gave them our computers, but they're not using them the way we intended!" were frequent. It appeared that there is little communication and no agreement between the two divisions.

The lack of in-depth discussion was evident on the agenda item related to evaluation of part-time instructors. The Dean gave brief instructions regarding complying with minimal procedures and said, "We look them over, check it off whether good, bad or indifferent." He asked, "Any suggestions of how to do it better?" and hearing none moved on. There was no discussion of the purpose of evaluation, how to do a good evaluation, or how to share evaluation results with the instructor for the purpose of improving instruction. It seemed to the consultant that this item lent itself to a good, thorough discussion.

4) Curriculum Committee Meeting

Of all the meetings observed by the consultant, this group used the most circular form of communication. There was lots of give and take, lots of discussion, and everyone around the table contributed to the discussion. Of the fifteen people present, three tended to dominate, but not to the extent that others were reluctant to contribute.

5) College Assembly

College Assembly meetings were conducted in much the same manner as the President's meetings: 1) participants sat around a rectangular table with the President at the head of the table, 2) the President chaired the meetings. However, this group engaged in more circular communication than the President's staff. Participants seemed to enjoy a high level of comfort and freedom to say whatever they felt. This was less true on the part of the classified representatives when faculty members were present. In the absence of faculty representatives, classified employees contributed much to the discussion. It is interesting to note that student representatives felt comfortable enough to not only contribute to discussion but to make motions. In both meetings attended by the consultant, members of the group reminded each other that they were there to vote according to the wishes of their constituencies.

6) Other Meetings

The consultant also observed an All-Staff meeting called by the President (and attended primarily by faculty), a meeting of the A.S.B. officers with the President, a Managers' meeting and meetings related to accreditation.

The All-Staff meeting was a budget speech by the President followed by a question and answer period. It was not very well attended (seventeen people present), but those in attendance seemed to feel free to ask questions and the President gave each question adequate attention.

The A.S.B. officers exhibited a sense of camaraderie with the President. They seemed to appreciate the attention he gave to their concerns which they voiced freely.

The Managers run their own meetings, having elected one of their own as a chairperson. The meeting was spirited and no-one seemed reluctant to speak up. The group seems to be coming together as a team.

Meetings related to accreditation were very task-oriented. Chaired by a faculty member, but made up of a cross-section of management, faculty and staff, this group works well together.

D. Significant Events and Culture

Two especially significant events occurred during the timeframe of this study: 1) the Art Search "crisis;" and 2) the disagreement over the agenda for Faculty Flex-Day.

Without going into extensive detail as to all of the actions and decisions surrounding these events, it became obvious to the consultant that the relationship between management and the leadership of the Faculty Senate/Association is adversarial at best. Discussions between the consultant and faculty and the consultant and management have lead to the realization that this adversarial relationship has a long history and is a part of the "corporate culture." This relationship is another form of territorialism similar to that which exists among departments and, to some extent between classified and certificated.

The research regarding corporate culture outlines four types of cultures most prevalent in organizations in this country. Victor Valley College has evidence of each of the four cultures. The overriding culture of the entire college organization is the "Process Culture." A process culture is one that is bureaucratic, where there is little risk taken, and where the focus is on "how" to do things, not "what" to do. In a process culture, trivial events take on major importance. Employees tend to talk to each other through paper with protectiveness and caution. Titles, function and procedures are important. Procedures (not following them, not understanding them, not agreeing on them, etc.) played a major role in the Art Search and Faculty-Flex Day problems. When problems erupted, the Faculty Senate/Association tended to "paper" its members in a typical process culture sort of way.

The other three cultures are competing subcultures within the overriding process culture. The three subcultures are the "Macho/Star" subculture, the "Work Hard/Play Hard" subculture and

the "Bet the Company" subculture. (These names were coined by Terrence Deal and Allen Kennedy in their book *Corporate Cultures*.)

The "Macho/Star" subculture is that of the faculty. Faculty members are individualists who tend to be somewhat autonomous. They can teach their classes pretty much however they please and can even behave outrageously as long as they do their job well. They come and go according to different schedules, are scattered all over campus, and many never see each other or become acquainted. The risks are few and little value is placed on the long-term perspective. For them, there is not much reward in being a part of a team and building a strong, cohesive culture among them is difficult.

The "Work Hard/Play Hard" subculture is that of the classified employees. They see themselves as a team, putting students first in everything they do. Feeling understaffed and overworked, for them activity is everything. Keeping busy, getting the job done and customer service are uppermost in their minds. They get immediate feedback from their customer, the student. Many of them see themselves as more student-oriented than the faculty leadership. In this subculture, the risks are small and the perspective is short-term.

The third competing subculture has few but powerful members--the "Bet the Company" subculture. This subculture consists of the President and a few administrators and other supporters. This subculture is willing to take high risks and look at the college and its activities through a long-range perspective. Immaturity in others is not tolerated. Mentoring is valued. Patience is required (although often in short supply) because of the long-term changes desired.

When there are strongly competing subcultures, territorialism and adversarial relationships occur. These are signs of a weak organizational culture. Other signs of a weak culture include: 1) inward focus; 2) short-term focus; 3) morale problems; and 4) emotional outbursts. During the course of this study all signs of a weak culture were observed.

On the other hand, signs of a strong culture include: 1) clearly articulated values and beliefs; 2) lots of verbal rather than written communication; 3) heroes and stories; 4) rituals and ceremonies; 5) shared goals and direction; and 6) high morale. It is encouraging to note that Victor Valley College has begun to take steps toward building a strong culture through the Institutional Effectiveness planning process. Values, beliefs, goals and direction are now being developed by large segments of the employee population and, hopefully, the process will begin to unite the group on a common mission and direction.

IV. CONCLUSION

The consultant has concluded that ten specific communication and cultural problems exist. They are as follows:

A. The President's management style is closer to autocratic than participative. However, it is the consultant's belief that the President *desires* to be participative and is attempting to learn those skills.

B. The confusion over the role of the Faculty Senate and the role of the Faculty Association is significant. The current style of the leadership of these two organizations perpetuates territorialism and adversarial relations with management.

C. Territorialism in other areas (besides faculty leadership vs. management) is also significant. The lack of communication between departments and divisions and the "us vs. them" attitude between classified and certificated contribute to a weak culture.

D. There is no shared "vision" or shared understanding of direction for the future of the college. Faculty and staff complain about "lack of direction from the top" failing to realize the importance of their own participation in shaping that vision.

Even top-level administrators fail to see their "relationship to other parts of the whole." They fail to understand that they can offer suggestions and criticism to areas in the organization other than their own. Likewise, they often fail to realize the impact their actions and decisions have on other areas within the college. The "big picture" perspective is lacking throughout the college.

E. There is a lack of a shared definition of participative management. The concept means different things to different people and connotes differing degrees of involvement in decision-making depending upon who is talking.

F. There is a perception that administrators spend too much time in their offices and don't get out among the employees often enough.

G. There appears to be significant blockages and/or "filtering" of information in the communication channels, both upward and downward. Occasionally, the filtering appears to be "by design." The "design" could be because certain managers and administrators believe in filtering on a "need to know" basis. Unfortunately, those on the receiving end (in some cases the President and in others a first level employee) often don't agree with the other person's determination of what is important for them to know (or unimportant, therefore They don't need to know.) On other occasions, the blockage or "filtering" appears to be intentional as a way of fostering divisiveness or to make some people "look good" and other "not so good."

H. The "President's team" is not a team. There is a lack of understanding of administrative roles, even the President's. Members of the President's team do not always support one another or the decisions made by the team. Some members of the team resort to "backbiting" and blaming other members of the team when they are back in their own areas of work.

I. Verbal communication takes place primarily in meetings, and even then is usually information sharing, not in-depth discussion of meaningful issues.

J. Outside of meetings, there is a heavy reliance on the *written* word.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The President needs to continue to develop his skills in participative management through reading, workshops and discussions with others. Likewise, and just as importantly, his immediate staff also need to develop these skills if the practice is to become wide-spread throughout the college. Joint workshops and retreats with faculty leadership would also be helpful in developing a common definition for participative management and would help to encourage candor and openness between faculty and management.

B. The Faculty Association and Faculty Senate need to be separate organizations with clearly defined powers, roles and duties. Faculty Senate needs to focus clearly on educational and professional issues. Faculty Association needs to focus on issues of salary and benefits, contract and working conditions. Faculty Association in its role as a "union" is, by its very nature, expected to be somewhat adversarial. Faculty Senate, on the other hand, needs to develop its own role and identity and more of a "partnership" attitude with management. This is not to suggest that the two groups should always agree. Rather, it is to suggest that the two should develop the attitude of working together in a problem-solving mode to find consensus solutions to problems.

C. Faculty, staff and management need to continue to work together to develop consensus beliefs, values, mission and vision for the college. The planning and evaluating process should involve all segments of the college "family" and should be a continuous, on-going process.

D. The President's team needs to do an analysis of their individual roles. They need to articulate the differences between the more on-campus, day-to-day, operational roles of the Vice-Presidents and Deans and the more symbolic, off-campus governmental and community relations role of the President. They need to analyze the ways in which they can show support for one another.

E. There needs to be less reliance on the written word, particularly memos, and more face-to-face informal communication. Administrators need to get out of their offices more often. (The physical plant presents some problems here.) However, administrators should take more responsibility for participating in campus events such as All-Staff meetings and Flex-Day activities. Faculty mailboxes need to be located closer to the faculty so that when written communication is necessary, it is received in a timely manner. There needs to be a system of intra-campus and inter-departmental mail delivery.

F. There needs to be more cross-cultural (meaning across the competing subcultures) "Task Forces" with clearly defined, short term objectives and fewer long-term standing committees.

G. All employees need to learn how to make meetings more effective. Agendas need to be structured to allow time for in-depth discussion of critical issues. More time needs to be devoted to planning and strategy sessions. The same person need not chair every session allowing everyone equal opportunity for input. Problem-solving techniques need to be practiced.

VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR ACCOMPLISHING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

It is easy for the consultant to suggest what needs to be done to improve the level of communication and to build a strong culture at Victor Valley College. It is less easy to suggest action steps to follow. The most significant suggestions would have to include the following:

- Spend more time discussing important issues with one another.
- Engage in more teambuilding and include the leadership of the faculty and classified staff in these activities.
- Get more training! Institute a comprehensive staff and management development program. Hold more retreats and workshops wherein you can practice new skills and lessen the competitiveness of the subcultures.
- Spend more time planning and envisioning the future. Ensure that the Institutional Effectiveness processes permeate all levels of the organization.
- Spend more time having "fun" together. Bonding and healing activities are a necessity Recognition of contributions to the organization and to each other is essential.
- Be patient and persistent. If the management, staff and faculty of Victor Valley College truly want to improve the level of communication and build a strong culture, a major cultural change must take place. Major changes don't occur overnight. They more often take 3-5 years.

VII. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The consultant would be remiss if she concluded this report without commenting on the growth that she has seen take place during the five months of this study. The fact that the study was occurring seemed to get a lot of people talking. Certain individuals among the faculty, staff and management appear to have been spending time examining their own communication processes and their beliefs about participative management. Some have confided to me that they're beginning to "buy-in" to the need for cultural change. Some have indicated they've already begun to see a lessening of adversarial relationships and the beginning of more cooperation. Several are beginning to get excited about the change process.

That's good because the President certainly can't do it alone. The change process has to be a partnership. The entire staff will need to exhibit a lot of tolerance with one another. Mistakes will be made because change is a learning process. Everyone will be practicing new skills and new behaviors.

The Board, management, faculty and staff are to be commended for commissioning this introspective analysis of themselves. For a public bureaucracy to take such a step is rare. Surely, as you succeed in this effort, you will be recognized as a leader among community colleges. Good luck to you as you continue to strive for excellence.

APPENDIX A

Tally of Organizational Communications Analysis

RESOURCE INSTRUMENT

ORGANIZATION COMMUNICATIONS ANALYSIS

Analyze the communication systems in your organization by checking the appropriate boxes if you utilize the practice.

56 surveys completed

system A — FORMAL

EXTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

- ☐ letters 47
- ☐ telephone 53
- ☐ advertising 22
- ☐ mass media 13
- ☐ press releases 18
- ☐ publications/reports 27
- ☐ public relations/marketing 19
- ☐ community relations program 20
- ☐ visits/field work 30
- ☐ teleconferencing 4
- ☐ products/services 11
- ☐ other FAX, meeting, display events, contact with students at offsite campuses
- ☐ plant/office appearance and atmosphere 18
- ☐ employee contacts (outside participation) 26
- ☐ grapevine/rumors 21
- ☐ visitor/guest relations 36
- ☐ networking 32
- ☐ other staff meetings

system C memos — INFORMAL

system B — FORMAL

INTERNAL ORGANIZATION COMMUNICATION

- ☐ letters/forms 43
- ☐ memoranda/reports 52
- ☐ signs/posters 40
- ☐ bulletin boards 39
- ☐ telephone 52
- ☐ computer/electronic mail 13
- ☐ closed circuit TV/radio 9
- ☐ office visits 35
- ☐ staff or other meetings 43
- ☐ organization chart for "hierarchy" communications 18
- ☐ task forces/committees 31
- ☐ other _____

- ☐ work relationships 47
- ☐ social relationships 32
- ☐ geographic relationships 10
- ☐ union/trade professional relationships 29
- ☐ client/customer relationships 30
- ☐ economic/status relationships 2
- ☐ cultural/religious relationships 10
- ☐ grapevine/gossip 24
- ☐ internal networking 30
- ☐ other status reports for work orders, projects, contact with individual

system D students for evaluation — INFORMAL

The previous conceptual model is simply a useful means of quickly reviewing the diversity of your organization communications. By completing the following questions, you may gain a greater understanding of the status of your communications system and what you can contribute to its improvement.

I. **IMAGE**

(a) What is your perception of your organization's image?

(b) What is your perception of your division's (department or work unit) image?

(c) What do you feel is the perception of your unit's image of those *outside* your immediate organization/division? (Consider this from the viewpoint of those people without the organization, such as the public, as well as those who are in the organization but are not a part of your unit - for example, members of other departments.)

II. **PUBLICS**

(a) Who are the various publics to whom you communicate your organizational messages? (Remember to include such varied recipients as suppliers, politicians and family.)

(b) What could be done to project a better organizational image to these people?

III. **COMMUNICATION FLOW**

Describe the direction of your formal communication systems:

(a) Internal:

- ☐ Downward (one-way) _____
- ☐ Upward _____
- ☐ Circular (two-way or participative) _____

(b) External:

- ☐ Outward _____
- ☐ Inward _____
- ☐ Circular _____

ORGANIZATION COMMUNICATIONS ANALYSIS

Surveyed at Victor Valley Community College District

January, 1992

I. IMAGE

(a) What is your perception of your organization's image?

In the community - generally very positive
The image has improved over the past few years
Good
Quite good
We are here to serve the students and the community
Professional, dynamic
Over all VVC has excellent reputation
Improving community-wide. Good place. Internally the feeling is we're not up-to-date.
Positive
Outside image - overall well run; inside image - a wonder it is still here
Very positive
Growing, changing
Positive as to product (teaching/learning), negative as to organization relationships
Unprofessional, uninformed, amateurish
Involved, active
Poor - very little communication from top down
A group of units trying to become one
Cold
It is improving but still needs considerable work
Nice place with fragmented problems
Has improved over last 10 years
Very divided - no clear direction or organization - us and them instead of we!
Good - looked at well
Below average (D-) fear tactics by the administration decreases trust and promotes fear
Serving students/community
Disorganized - combative - fragmented - petty. Hard-working people in above environment
Distrustful
Poor for administrator - hides in office
That we are here to help students
Improving but still not high quality
Does a pretty good job in serving student educational needs
Mixed image in community. Respected by many, but not by many
Higher prestige than high school, lower than university
Improving daily - highly regarded
Very well organized

Mediocre
Good
For the most part good, but with rapid growth, it is slipping
Generally good
Leader in the community
Important to the overall community
Positive image
Overall, above average image - mostly positive
Education
To provide a service to the general public
Good in most cases but it definitely could use some improvement
Very good
Excellent
Fast growing community college attempting to meet increasing demands
Receptive, student-oriented, friendly, professional
Good
Favorable in community
Poor within community
Growing community college with some fine programs and faculty
Very good, professional!

(b) What is your perception of your division's (Department or work unit) image?

Annoy other departments - not very good (they look down on us)
I feel our department has a good image, both internally and externally
Good
OK
Same as above - more emphasis on student service, also to staff and faculty
Mostly hard working, short-handed, struggling to keep up!
Good, having some reorganization growing pains
Over-burdened, neglected, low on the totem pole, red-headed step child
Competent
Outside contacts - efficient, gets job done; inside contacts - lucky they know my area exists unless there is trouble
Hard-working, very positive
Division - diverse; department - needs updated equipment
Very positive both in-house and within community
Knowledgeable, efficient, friendly atmosphere
Obscure but progressing into validity
Very poor - must find out on my own, not communicated with - outside the loop.
A whole make up of many parts, working together as a unit

Good working relationships, caring
Good as far as what we do but not so good as far as importance
Disorganized, weak management, unclear
Many staff don't know what we do
Overworked, trying to provide services as best we can
Needs work - new dean, need more leadership
Very good, but absorbing many stilettos in the back from administration
Professional
Up front, hard-working, at times rebellious
So-so
That our job to publicize VVC is being done
Pretty good. Hands are somewhat tied to do everything we want
Professional, well-organized, productive, happy
Overworked - unorganized
Good quality - timely - well-planned and executed
Excellent leadership
Mediocre
Good
Very busy, but still takes time to help & smile
Good but low on totem pole
Positive, strong
Nucleus for the student population, 100% contact with student
Positive image
Extremely positive, helpful, friendly, patient, understanding
Student Services
Great, we have regular meetings to discuss ways of upgrading services and relations
Very good
Good but needs more positive, winning attitude
Positive - we strive to meet student needs as they arise
Helpful
Average
Productive - quality
Medium to good/productive
Well thought of and highly respected department
Very good, professional!

(c) What do you feel is the perception of your unit's image of those outside your immediate organization/division?

I don't understand the question!
We all do our jobs and get along well. We're hard workers and do our jobs with a high degree of efficiency and pride.
Good
I hope quite good
Same as above
Same as "B"
Lack of cohesiveness and support

Wow, you do so much! How do you do it? Neat place to work. Fun job.
The department is doing a good job helping students and their employees.
Ditto above - except some areas on campus realize what goes on and appreciate a job done well
Very positive
I believe others view the department as a growing/cohesive department
Positive
other units omniscient in computers, public - functional support system
Not quite sure of our purpose nor our ability
Much better than in my department, other departments communicate much better
Tight, formal, misunderstood
Cold, impersonal, computerized, capable of doing anything, we are supposed to be able to fix everything
That we are competent but are we necessary
Don't know our benefits to them
Only see negatives, when we have to be the "no" men, never acknowledge the positive.
Looked at fairly favorably
Public milieu is not good and seemingly becoming worse without forgiveness
Rigid, unbending
Serious - hard-working - "nit-pickers" who don't care about students
Dean of Business & Industry has excellent network connections with public
Not sure. Too many, probably provides a useful service
I think our department is highly respected and valued in the community
Distrust and/or indifference to administration
It is believed we only function on one level, whereas we do considerable
Parents very satisfied with program. Word of mouth is our badge of honor.
Competent
Good
Many have put up barricades are are not available during work hours
Good but generally not very important
Important to their functions
Mainly positive image
Same as above
Student services
To work as a team, to complete the other task that should be provided which could not be provided by my unit
Good
Satisfaction
Needs more victories
Unless employee has asked for help in using our

resources, they probably don't understand our function
Helpful, user-friendly
Very good
Produces graduates who are desirable employees
Not important
Well thought of and highly respected department
Very good, very cooperative

II. PUBLICS

(a) Who are the various publics to whom you communicate your organizational messages?

Students, public at large, other faculty, administrators, classified staff.
We aim at high school - adult-aged people.
Students, suppliers
Audiences at performances
Publishers, field representatives, etc.
PAC attendees, "students," part-time instructors
Students, families, hospitals, and home health agencies
Professional theatre company, Chamber of Commerce, school districts, local business, non-profit organizations
Industry, professional organization, vendors
Counterparts at other colleges; Chancellor's Office; County of San Bernardino; family, friends, neighbors, suppliers
Community residents
Advisory committee members
Student, campus staff, general public, area schools
San Bernardino County, state officials, suppliers, family, and friends
Students, community, businesses
CCEI, CITEA
Auditors, suppliers, students
Suppliers, family, community, San Bernardino County, high schools
Students, faculty, administration, community, departments, divisions, staff
Key community people and other schools
Business
What organizational message - everyone forgets we are here for the students. Everyone is so busy preserving their own areas they forget this!
Clerical sites, non-profit organizations, businesses
The Faculty Senate
Staff, students, county schools, vendors, community members
Anyone who phones
Friends, public figures
Students, occasional connections with public
High Desert Residents via newspapers/radio/tv
VVC students, elementary, junior high, and high school

students, other colleges, staff and faculty, community members, other libraries, suppliers

Students

Students, business people, legislators, board, staff, community, fellow workers, etc.

Local places of business. Anyone that will lend me an ear.

Community (business and private), other colleges, state agencies, national agencies

Advisory committee - suppliers, trade associations, garden clubs, newsletter

Local office suppliers, high schools, general public, local businesses

General public, prospective students, friends, church members

Schools, businesses

Friends, family, community

Students, community members

Family, friends, students, & instructors

Students, instructors

Students, public, administrators, and instructors

Students and their families; instructors

Students, faculty, and staff, community members

Students, perspective students, parents, neighbors

Employment development department (state), GAIN, state rehab, private rehab companies, AAUW, family, friends, classmates

Vendors, family, potential students

Students, high schools, Dept. of Social Services

Publishers, schools, administrators

Hospitals, staff, other community colleges, family, friends

Community, students, public safety organizations

(b) What could be done to project a better organizational image to these people?

More clear-cut organization, give better information, have a reputable manager, high quality handouts and brochures

Our student population is at CAP+, I do not feel we need to do anything more at this time. We should maintain our current procedures.

More information

More popular shows

Sufficient staff and resources to raise "service level"

Being able to provide more classes for the hundreds of people who don't get into VVC

Better staffing would allow us to be less harried and stressed

Increasing the emphasis in this area and spending time working on it

Clean up our act internally - if a commitment is made to the outsider, let those inside know, especially those involved with setting it up.

More in-house help with PR, more faculty, more support staff
Affirmative attitude when responding to inquiries
Be able to offer more classes so as not to frustrate students
If department chair was not hostile to these organizations
Internal is not bad
More staff
Involve them in meetings for the public
It may be too late because of administrative arrogance, bias, threat tactics, and prejudice.
Don't know
Relax the entrance requirements; mingle with the common folk more
Our problem is not in projecting to the public but in house - only why would public be interested in our organizational image?
Nothing
New library, more staff. We're very crowded.
Have support from administration
Get everyone involved in communications effort
Reputation for service and responsiveness, accomplishment and recognition, better networking
Radio and tv communication as well as accurate newspaper releases
Have some of the high administrators really look at what we do
Understanding of what we are doing for them nor or in the future. Set up meeting with public on our process
Phone-in registration available to all students (dream on!)
To be able to offer an increasing number of classes
More work space
More interaction among groups
Always have a positive attitude and to remember
Improved means of communication
Let them know importance of students, their education, and overall well-being
Design flyer that explains services we offer
Tooting our own horn! Meetings with school districts, churches, VVC faculty, EDD Office, AFDC Office
Improve internal organization of department
Better administrative visual support
More media attention, newspapers and radio/tv spots
Increase staffing, reduce dependence on voice mail

III. COMMUNICATION FLOW

Describe the direction of your formal communication systems:

Internal:

Downward (one-way)

Easy, relaxed, friendly, clear, cordial
To hourly workers for daily work assignment; Bookstore
Talk, memos
To line workers daily
Always
I do communicate to those I work with - a better-informed person is a better person at work; I get very little info from immediate supervisor and above
To other faculty
Rarely - usually two-way
Very little to none
No one under me to communicate with
Notes, memos, directives to staff
Not much "officially," all seems to be grapevine stuff
Staff meetings twice weekly
Never - I never forget where I came from
No one below me
There is none
Timely, clear
Organization: memos, monthly meetings. Almost totally one-way. Department: daily conversation, weekly librarian meetings, biweekly staff meetings, typed minutes. Downward from me: verbal as needed.
N/A
Never
Never
Giving directions
Giving updated info to students
Information
I share info verbally with staff as needed to ensure that info disseminated is accurate
From administration

Upward

Tense, careful, cautious
To my supervisor
Notes or memos
Talk, memos
To administrator periodically
Always
I do this, sometimes not to my benefit
To dean, VP's, president
Daily - as necessary
Often, but I expect and solicit response!
All goes through department chair
A/R, Bookstore, Bursar, Controller
Meetings, memos, reports to VP
Don't receive "written" responses and then message is changed
One-way, information only
50-50
Only my boss

Clear, infrequent
Open communication with director, limited communication with higher administration. Had one meeting with vice-president.
N/A
Several
Information
Memos and meetings as needed

Circular

Collegial
Those in my office; other departments, participation on committees
Memos
Circulate minutes
Memos, etc., to and from departments
To line workers and co-worker weekly
Most of the time
I believe in two-way or participative communications, we all need to be able to say what we feel and think and share ideas, rumors, information freely
All of the above
Daily - as necessary
Almost always participative
Flow from me to department chair, none from department chair to me
A/R, Bookstore, Bursar, Controller, A/P
Meetings, daily interaction
Not much of this goes on
Attempt is to promote open communication but administrative blocking interferes. Administration works through flash rather than content.
I do not initiate
One-on-one
Effective, occasional difference of opinion
Regular with director and other department staff. Infrequent with other administrators. Some with other departments.
Notes - work of mouth
The president meets with me and I meet with others and vice-versa
Mainly
Everyday with co-workers
Discussion, decision-making, sharing of ideas
Staff meetings, informal discussions regarding procedures
Weekly meetings
Within department

External:

Outward
Vendors; county offices (computer system); committee work

Memos and phone calls to Sam
Weekly for clarification, to solicit information
As necessary
I do my best to keep communications open
To area schools, general public, other colleges
As necessary
My function is dependent on open and continual communication with external sources
I have had to resort to written memo as verbal was ignored
Memos, letters, telephone, person to person
Information
I have very little opportunity to communicate with public or little reason for them to communicate with me
Infrequent
We try to communicate with faculty concerning services, collection development, curriculum
Letters - phone
Information
Attend meetings as invited to explain functions of our department

Inward

Arranging lodging; director for a future seminar for classified
Phone calls
Frequently
I do my best to keep communications open
From area schools, etc.
As necessary
Little to none
Same
Information pertinent to the success of the college
Don't understand this relationship
Use meetings, memos, handbooks, spoken communication to brief part-time librarians, students workers, etc. informed on policies, procedures, etc.
Provide orientations for local, state, agencies

Circular

State/federal agencies regarding student billings and procedure
Letters, memos, telephone calls to and from departments
Most directive - not consulted!
Seldom
Good deal of thoughtful communication with those I need to deal with
As necessary
Little to none
Meetings, committees
Involving the public through publicity as well as the faculty and students

I do not initiate
Effective
Meet frequently to exchange ideas and keep informed on policies, etc. Always trying to improve.
N/A
We seek input ads well as established outflow. Input is generally casual
Less well developed since networking not established as should be
Sometimes not enough
Friends. Helping new students understand our process is a day-to-day communication.

V. ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

(a) The improvement of both formal and informal communications can contribute significantly toward bettering the organizational atmosphere. What other recommendations can you make in this regard next week?

The palpable tension is, I think, a direct result of people in administrative roles (and others too) who are acting with dishonesty or with a lack of concern for others. I believe this needs to be uncovered and discussed. Being sneaky and underhanded may be so ingrained in some folks that it may be hard to change.
Communicating is not really the issue. Staff members are asked for input but are frustrated and feel there is no point. Important committees make recommendations, but in the end the president makes his decision based on his initial desire, not considering recommendations made.
Getting information I need to be more efficient
No one has enough time
Need more information to respond
Longer range, small project planning, and also recommends adoption of in-house facility planning reports
Strides toward improving communications are going well. I feel informed about the organization and the plans proposed.
Communication between the various groups on campus could be improved if the communicative techniques utilized were more "circular" and less downward. Atmosphere could be improved if administrative interpretation of agreed-upon documents more closely matched the intent at the time of agreement and more flexibility were demonstrated.
Learning to trust again - or if not, just stop the negatives
Timely communication at all levels (from hiring down)
Beginning of the lists for all due dates: budget, curriculum, book orders, schedules, regular

reports; clear times for college committee/department meetings; no rush requests - plan ahead; time parameters for administrative responses to all requests

A competitive element and territoriality is a problem - if this could be overcome communication would not be a problem. We don't seem to know how to work together freely, let alone communicate.

Have all "factions" on campus be open and straightforward. We seem split by functional areas in the way we perceive issues and our attitudes, which is not uncommon, but is a hindrance to accomplishing our mission. There is a general lack of communication between all groups. We need to focus our agendas on the same objectives as a whole. We all must be committed to doing our part and be accountable and responsible.

To have a department chair that will listen instead of put you down

Create a better communication and understanding between offices and departments, faculty and classified/management

Communications on campus is terrible, beginning from the top and gets worse on the way down. Those in positions of "authority" should take time to listen and actually hear what is being said. Ask for information in understandable language to a lay-person. This survey is a perfect example of why there is a communications problem on this campus in the first place.

No more radio commercials regarding admissions

The channels that are established for disseminating information from the president to Cabinet to deans does not flow from the VP level unless it is very specific to a group. Are the Fireside Chats still in existence?

Establish clearer, more unified procedures

Should impress upon the staff the importance of sharing positive aspects to students - they are the public!

More timely communications of what is happening that affects us. What kind of message does the Board send us about the budget! They change their mind about the location of the Board room from one meeting to the next with no reasoning to the general campus. They act omnipotent, as if no one needs to know.

Need a better check and balance system - paperwork is generated and no idea what's being done with it. Better communication with deans and higher management to pass information down to department heads and instructors

Unilateral and dictatorial administrative judgments are creating a negative campus and community climate at VVC.

Leave the paperwork alone - visit with people. We're drowning in memos

Get superintendent/president out of his office so he can communicate with faculty/staff on their turf - not his

I found this questionnaire confusing and not relevant to the problem of lack of communication at VVC. Many times we have discussed this problem and suggested methods of solution, but they haven't seemed to work. One prime example of the lack of communication is the fact that the Public Information Office did not receive notification from the nursing department on the striping ceremony for nursing students. Dr. Gould has been trying to keep the staff informed by weekly news updates, but getting information is like pulling teeth.

Greater effort in keeping good communication with those who are difficult

More contact from top, although our director is doing a great job representing us.

Frankly, as a teacher I don't feel part of <u>any</u> aspect of the decision-making process. I feel like a subordinate, sometimes victim - an employee only. So <u>any</u> communication making me aware of part of the running of VVC would be an improvement.

Immediate communication with various groups and contributors, rather than critics. It's easy to undermine, but hard to develop solutions.

Monthly drills with children

The last thing we need to do is set up more committees or "structured" communications. If we can establish habits of informally keeping each other informed and working together, more will be done to improve communications than all the committees ever formed. At present there is a tradition of false expectation (everything has to be discussed with everyone), almost an eagerness to take offense (nobody asked me about this), and of assigning blame rather than helping to solve problems.

It is satisfactory. This form does not fit our situation.

We have discussed more and better signs; map (layout) of the campus for visitors in one or more areas on campus; more social get-togethers would improve the informal communication; anyone using public media forums to advertise college events/classes, activities should clear it first with <u>all</u> offices and college employees involved for accuracy of content.

Lots of surveys like this one have been sent out, answered, and very rarely does any positive action result. Committees are made to make decisions, they meet, discuss, debate, disagree, and eventually arrive at a compromise.

Recommendations are sent to those who requested the committee and nothing happens.

When "lower" division workers suggest changes and they are taken to "upper" management, the communication of what has been heard, what is being done, and possible completion of change is appreciated to all concerned. It helps for everyone to understand reason for change to enhance the "unit" of the organization. Surveys help if they are written in an understandable way and if something can be accomplished.

Be clear and concise. This form is a poor communication tool in itself - hard to understand if responding correctly or even what the questions are asking.

What purpose do these surveys serve? I feel that these are a waste of time and money and there is rarely any follow-up. Consider using our money more wisely.

Surveys seem to be a waste of time and money. We communicate but then nothing happens.

These questions should be geared to VVC. After filling out many questionnaires, I never know the outcome. People should learn to like others in other departments. If we all consider ourselves as one big team we will communicate better. I feel proud to work at VVC and when I refer a student to another area I want to know that he will receive the same great service.

Keep an open mind and positive attitude

Listen carefully. Be patient with those who may not understand the system or your particular job as well as you do, be polite and courteous at all times, even when it hurts.

Be receptive to suggestions as well constant communications

It would have been helpful to have attended a conference to learn the purpose and meaning of this study and to clarify terminology. I hope this gets the information the administration needs. As a new staff member I'm limited in having an overall view of the college.

The VP of Instruction must work on improving open lines of communication, from both internal and external sources. They must be open and receptive to suggestions, complaints, and comments from faculty and students without fear of retaliation. Also seeing the administration on campus instead of just in meetings would help improve morale and personalize written communications. Gloria Henderson is doing an excellent job of keeping faculty informed.

Administration needs to learn/study and apply more participative management methods. Decision-making should be on a shared governance level, but it

doesn't truly seem to be done. Instead, decisions are made unilaterally and mistrust continues to linger between faculty and administration.

(b) What strategy or procedures will you utilize to accomplish this?

It believe very strongly in the ongoing practice of management development. Some of our managers (most?) simply do not understand the concept of "participative management." I bet they're afraid of it. I think some basic instruction in what it is, how to do it, and how much easier it is for them once they adopt it, would help our communication problems considerably!

On a lower scale communication is a problem. I am fortunate to work for a supervisor who holds a staff meeting after each board meeting. Other departments feel resentful at being "the last to know." Employees get a feeling of being second class and not important enough to warrant being informed.

None

Stay the way I am - open and accessible. At this point even if formal/informal lines of communication were better established, communication is distorted. Am not sure what can be done to instill trust in all areas on campus - can trust be taught or re-learned?

Active linking of campus to a communications network of all offices - faculty, department, classified, etc. for E mail, messaging, and other communications. We use a large number of computers very poorly and could vastly reduce the paper blizzard with a minimal cost.

Possible updates on department happenings, forums between management and faculty

Change radio dollars to PAC ads (this semester was a big improvement over summer and fall, 1991!). Faculty gives the impression that classified and some administration are far beneath them and they cannot be bothered with them.

VVC standard guide or manual of procedures for internal/external communications. Standardization could help eliminate some problems and reduce volume of unnecessary memos, improving overall communication process, quality, and quantity.

There is no one in administration to promote academic prowess. Administration has too many conflicts focusing on their own self-image rather than an academic image of our basic teaching image. Faculty is being bullied and morale is sinking fast.

There is not a general attitude of "this is a business" but more one of a "day care/social worker" atmosphere - creativity and individuality are the watch word. Whereas entering, processing, and educating students and maintaining facilities is the business. This is a poorly written survey instrument - questions vague and lacking in direction.

I make it a point to visit with people.

Visits to our department, spend some time here to see all the good things we do and how valuable we are to the organization.

Phone message system, personal meetings with leadership, and coming to a common understanding

First aid and CPR for all staff

Again, an open mind and a positive attitude - myself. All the meetings and forms in the world will not aid communications if everyone does not act on it.

Written input from each employee concerning ideas

APPENDIX B

Tally of Group Communication Assessment

TALLY

GROUP COMMUNICATION ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT & LEARNING INSTRUMENTS FOR MANAGEMENT, SUPERVISORY & ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Organization: Victor Valley College

Branch/Location: _____

Unit Code: _____ Date: _____

TALICO Inc.

2320 S. 3rd St. #5
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

GROUP COMMUNICATION ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTIONS

The following are 30 conditions in statement form (20 in Part A and 10 in Part B) that can occur when groups or teams of employees meet to discuss work related matters. Please read each statement carefully. Think of the condition as it might apply to the group or team of which you are a participant. Then indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a mark in the appropriate column to the right.

			(4 pts) STRONGLY AGREE	(3 pts) SOMEWHAT AGREE	(2 pts) SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	(1 pt) STRONGLY DISAGREE	
PART A		Raw Item score					
Avg Item score / 3.6	1.	Most of the information shared among members of our group is relevant to the group task. (108)	14 [ ]	12 [ ]	4 [ ]	0 [ ]	(30)
2.52	2.	We usually have sufficient information to deal effectively with the group task. (73)	4 [ ]	12 [ ]	8 [ ]	5 [ ]	(29)
2.97	3.	Most members of our group have respect for each other. (86)	8 [ ]	15 [ ]	3 [ ]	3 [ ]	(29)
2.75	4.	Communication by members of our group is usually frank and honest. (77)	6 [ ]	12 [ ]	7 [ ]	3 [ ]	(28)
3.66	5.	The average member of our group usually has something meaningful to contribute to the discussion. (106)	14 [ ]	12 [ ]	3 [ ]	0 [ ]	(29)
2.62	6.	Most of the information that we have about the group task is timely. (76)	7 [ ]	9 [ ]	8 [ ]	5 [ ]	(29)
2.41	7.	There is a great deal of trust among the members of our group. (70)	4 [ ]	9 [ ]	11 [ ]	5 [ ]	(29)
2.61	8.	We deal with each other in a fair and honest way. (81)	5 [ ]	13 [ ]	9 [ ]	4 [ ]	(31)
3.2	9.	Generally, our group's discussions focus on the group task. (96)	9 [ ]	18 [ ]	3 [ ]	0 [ ]	(30)

Avg Item	Raw Item Score			(4pts) STRONGLY AGREE	(3pts) SOMEWHAT AGREE	(2pts) SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	(1pt) STRONGLY DISAGREE	
2.79	(81)	10.	Generally, the information that we get about the group task is accurate.	6 [ ]	13 [ ]	8 [ ]	2 [ ]	(29)
2.66	(77)	11.	The quality of the interpersonal relationships among members of our group is high.	5 [ ]	12 [ ]	9 [ ]	3 [ ]	(29)
2.59	(75)	12.	In our organization people openly express their feelings, concerns and opinions.	6 [ ]	9 [ ]	10 [ ]	4 [ ]	(29)
3.46	(97)	13.	Our group usually deals with issues that can have an important effect on the group task.	9 [ ]	14 [ ]	4 [ ]	1 [ ]	(28)
2.72	(79)	14.	We usually have sufficient information to do the group task properly.	4 [ ]	15 [ ]	8 [ ]	2 [ ]	(29)
2.87	(86)	15.	The members of our group get along quite well with each other.	6 [ ]	16 [ ]	6 [ ]	2 [ ]	(30)
2.17	(65)	16.	There are very few secrets among the members of the group.	3 [ ]	9 [ ]	8 [ ]	10 [ ]	(30)
2.69	(78)	17.	The information that our group shares with each other is seldom trivial or irrelevant to our main objective.	4 [ ]	13 [ ]	11 [ ]	1 [ ]	(29)
2.3	(69)	18.	It is unusual for us to have a problem with the accuracy and timeliness of the information that we obtain.	1 [ ]	13 [ ]	10 [ ]	6 [ ]	(30)
2.6	(78)	19.	We seldom have unconstructive bickering and conflict within our group.	6 [ ]	12 [ ]	6 [ ]	6 [ ]	(30)
2.38	(69)	20.	The members of our group feel free to discuss group task related issues in an open, honest and candid way.	5 [ ]	11 [ ]	8 [ ]	5 [ ]	(29)

COMMENTS:

Set A (1, 5, 9, 13, 17) - Relevancy, meaningfulness — Avg. raw score 97 (Avg 3.32)
Set B (2, 6, 10, 14, 18) - Accuracy, sufficiency, timeliness — Avg. raw score 75.6 (2.59)
Set C (3, 7, 11, 15, 19) - Trust and respect — Avg. raw score 79.4 (2.7)
Set D (4, 8, 12, 16, 20) - Candor, honesty, openness — Avg. raw score 73.4 (2.5)
Set E (21-30) - Supportive behaviors — Avg raw score 74. (2.84)

Item Score (raw)	PART B		(4pts) STRONGLY AGREE	(3pts) SOMEWHAT AGREE	(2pts) SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	(1pt) STRONGLY DISAGREE	
2.85 (74)	21.	The members of our group fully participate in discussions about the group task.	[8]	[8]	[8]	[2]	(26)
2.96 (77)	22.	We make a point of soliciting ideas and suggestions about the group task from each other.	[7]	[12]	[6]	[1]	(26)
2.73 (71)	23.	We listen carefully to what each group member has to say.	[5]	[12]	[6]	[3]	(26)
2.88 (75)	24.	If one member of our group has trouble expressing him/herself the rest of us will help him/her clarify his/her ideas.	[7]	[11]	[6]	[2]	(26)
2.92 (76)	25.	We all seem to be interested in the group task.	[7]	[11]	[7]	[1]	(26)
2.85 (74)	26.	No one is ignored during our group's discussions.	[8]	[8]	[8]	[2]	(26)
2.65 (69)	27.	If conflict arises within the group we all do what we can to help resolve it.	[7]	[7]	[8]	[4]	(26)
2.85 (74)	28.	We encourage each other to openly and candidly say what we think.	[7]	[11]	[5]	[3]	(26)
2.92 (76)	29.	When a member of our group has an especially good idea we give him/her appropriate praise and recognition.	[5]	[15]	[5]	[1]	(26)
2.85 (74)	30.	We seldom if ever, put a group member 'down', even in jest.	[5]	[15]	[3]	[3]	(26)

COMMENTS:

SCORING KEY

	Part A	Part B	VVC's Part A	VVC's Part B
Very Good	70-80	35-40		
Good	60-70	30-35		
Fair	50-60	25-30	55, 57	28, 46
Poor	Below 50	Below 25	FAIR	

APPENDIX C

Faculty Survey Conducted by Faculty Senate

FACULTY SURVEY

Presented by Gloria Henderson

January 10, 1992

QUESTION 1: What do you think the role of the Faculty Senate should be?

* Represent majority.
* Represent faculty in academic affairs.
* Represent faculty for issues.
* Stand behind, support, and govern the faculty at school.
* Take care of working welfare, faculty in general.
* Spokes group.
* Advocate.
* Voice and philosophy of feelings.
* Look after and protect rights of faculty while keeping in mind good of campus as a whole.
* Leadership role. Senate can instigate positive changes. Work for positive approach for goals of college. It should be a coagulation, a combination of input from classified staff, faculty and administration. We've got a message of education, and we must keep that basic premise together and keep that message on track.
* Unique campus. Faculty Senate members have access to make process work, to be a conduit for information, making policies, validating campus governments.
* What it's supposed to be is what it is right now.
* An advisory as well as a recommending body, and to participate and represent faculty in shared governance under AB 1725, the form of discussion.
* Aid and share in governance of colleagues, and not just give opinions, and follow-through with actions. Establishing priorities.
* Representing total faculty in input in formulating the policy that affects entire college.
* A check-point balance between college government and fiscal spending.
* The hub for faculty, input from spokes (faculty members). Make sure they are serving entire faculty or majority.
* Should be a leader and policing professional ethics of faculty, leadership and professional growth of the faculty.
* An agency or group that sort of polices our own and gets rid of our dead-beats, and makes sure we have the most professional staff we can have.
* Major decision-making authority in running the campus, because the members are in the trenches, and they know what's going on.
* Trying to achieve those goals that are set by the majority of faculty that are in agreement that would prioritized their needs.
* Coordinating/information center if someone wants to know what's going on, that's the place to go. The right area where someone's watching so that we don't get taken advantage of.
* Represent all opinions of faculty and those ideas in writing and/or orally to project those opinions of all faculty not just those of the Faculty Senate.

* Sounding board for issues in order to figure out what type of consensus or flow there is in the faculty.
* Offering advice and listening carefully, paying careful attention to both sides of any issue.
* The body representing the faculty, where the faculty comes to air their grievances, to see if people are in agreement. Important for faculty to feel like a group, like an identification--a big part of it.
* Representing the view of faculty to administration and also to community. Get things accomplished that would benefit the college and students. Make communication right.
* Co-decision maker with administration. That's what legislation says we should be. We should contribute to major decisions.
* A liaison with our administration, board and also with classified.
* An advisement body expressing faculty concerns to any other public body to make needs known.
* A lot less than it ~~is now~~ Disturbed about two administrations: faculty and ~~administration~~. Double the paperwork, double the people, not the least bit efficient.
* Why does administration get paid more than faculty?
* Leading body of campus, campus watch-dog. Have a major decision role in planning for campus growth, curriculum, programs, instruction on campus.
* Should be responsible for all aspects of academic-related faculty concerns whether it's development, class schedules, interaction between the faculty, administration, and classified, all inclusive.
* Insure a work place that is: (1) stress-free, (2) professional and, (3) competent as possible within faculty structure that they hire qualified faculty. To promote general welfare of overall faculty.
* Address principally academic concerns.
* Primarily, overseeing, and unifying the curriculum campus-wide, making sure overall course offerings make some kind of sense regarding college philosophy
* Improve instruction, make sure students are represented.
* Same role it is now. The law has a role for it. It takes care of ~~academic matters that are non-negotiable in our contract~~.
* Health and benefits of faculty. Getting fair treatment, fair pay.
* I'm not too involved in this stuff. I leave it up to activists; they seem to be doing a good job. I think direction they're taking is the right direction.
* I don't know.
* Not certain what their role is.
* I'm not really aware of how they fit into everything.
* It's not too clear in my mind.
* I really don't know what Faculty Senate is all about: I don't know if they are: A representative, legislative, political body.
* I don't have any idea. They're supposed to deal with academic affairs, teacher accreditation and instructional issues, sabbaticals, etc. I know only what I read, that's my only reflection of what they're doing.
* I assume that they try to help with problems in school in terms of money, class size, etc. I'm not sure what they do.

QUESTION 2: What type of support or help would you like from the Faculty Senate?

* Doing a good job. Reps working very hard at shared governance.
* We need more of a connection between Senate representatives and the rest of the faculty. There is a real gap.
* Address concerns that affect us all, major academic concerns.
* The Faculty Senate offers the type of support we need now. They are advocates of the faculty and speak for the faculty. Again, the issue of careful attention comes in. We should all collectively be trying to work together (the college).
* Faculty Senate should help me represent my views to the other faculty and administration because I don't have the time to do it myself.
* Making sure that everybody is aware of everything that is going on--to keep asking for input and ideas.
* More unity among the faculty in setting forth proper rules and guidelines for everyone equally.
* Deal with issues and disagreements, listen and take action. Have some sort of avenue for discourse, explaining situations.
* I know what they're trying to do, but they need to bring all factors of the faculty together. There are many different directions, and they need to come together. Many departments for the faculty, they need to become more focused. A little more channeled in a unified direction without continual administrative random and arbitrary decision-making. Administrative decisions need to be clarified for more effective functioning of the Faculty Senate that transcends itself ultimately into the classroom. G.H. is doing is suburb job. A lot of class.
* I really don't have anything, but be representative and have my voice with administration and board.
* Faculty Senate support should be representative of the faculty and their programs; taking into consideration the needs of all segments of all faculty.
* If there is any academic affair that I need support with, that's what I need them to do. Academic affairs include counseling.
* Good communication between faculty members.
* Pretty much what they're doing. Trying to continue putting feelers out and being sensitive to what is happening with administration so that we can be on top of many issues that are of importance to us, and to share the information back. Also to listen very carefully to the special interests and needs of different areas/departments on campus, and further to voice the needs of faculty to administration whenever necessary or appropriate. They're doing it--it's a continued need.
* Support in carrying faculty message to administration and board. Support in negotiating contracts, support in making sure we have the highest quality faculty, support in upgrading our teaching, learning skills.
* What we need from them is to have the overall view of the faculty be represented.
* I have already received support when I have needed a collegial body. It's important to know that your faculty colleagues will support you in any stance, support your positions. They may not agree but they should support a faculty member's effort. On this campus, we tend to personalize positions (depends on who's saying it, the person or personality).
* The ability to communicate with senate as to what the needs of entire faculty are and entire school. Their support of pushing through areas or concerns that faculty see as relevant to school

and service to our students.

* Support new positions, support in any disciplinary action taken by administration.
* The issue of a strong presence, making sure that it is governing body with actual power to be defined precisely.
* They're doing a reasonably good job, but I would like them to consider more fully issues like classroom size and lecture courses.
* I'm not certain what help I may need from them. I could use some assistance with instructional materials, classroom teaching facilities. I'm not certain that the Faculty Senate is the entity to approach for this.
* Help in keeping class size down, maintaining competitive salaries, insuring teacher rights under administration, and serving as liaison between administration and faculty.
* Driving force--getting educational tools--computers, classroom technology, etc. Emphasis on education.
* More commitment from administration for instructional supplies, updating audio visual equipment, have adequate seating for students in a classroom. Facilities are not always available on weekends even though there are weekend classes. Have to bring own stuff (equipment) in.
* Issues are now being addressed. Support in development of both curriculum and programs. They both go hand-in-hand. Being sure that committee work that's being done is worth doing. This is a concern of current Faculty Senate president.
* 2 important issues:
  lab/lecture ratio
  50 min. lab. - 7 1/2 hr. day - very long.
* Right now in the Nursing Department there are a lot of issues. D. Galvez is trying to get things worked out right now. Team-teach works toward disadvantage. 10-17 students have to be chased around.
* Make sure they don't hurt anybody. Hard to do.
* Support for instructional programs. Looking out for instructors doing their job.
* Getting support from the Faculty Senate.
  Main support is our voice to board.
* They're doing everything they need to do. They're supporting me as well as I expect to be.
* Very supportive and helpful as far as what's going on campus.
* Negotiating process and above. They promote an open forum for discussion of issues. It has improved a lot because of Gloria Henderson. Keep doing what you're doing Gloria Henderson.
* Arbitrator between faculty, forum for redress for faculty, colleagues, deans.
* Most faculty want to be listened to when they have a concern--when they want their concerns brought before the Senate and acted upon. Sounding board. If more people are voicing the same problem, you know it has to be dealt with.
* Sustenance of acceptable working conditions. With salary, they're doing an excellent job.
* I have felt in the last few years that most of us are not participating enough I think the organizations -- CTA/Faculty Senate are a blur as to what they do and how we are represented. Maybe they should communicate more to faculty members as to what the role of each of these organizations is.
* I want to thank the Faculty Senate president for her support. I can personally attest to the fact that Gloria Henderson is the best Faculty Senate President we have ever had. When she says

she's going to do something, she follows through until the goal is reached. Let future Faculty Senate presidents learn from her.

* Again, I'm just happy with what they've been doing, and I hope it continues.
* Doing an excellent job, but too much bureaucracy and too much detail.
* They're doing as good a job that they can do. No improvements are necessary. I don't think they can do much more than they are doing right now.
* Assume that they are going to add to representative body, I would like to know what is being decided at administrative and faculty levels about our responsibilities. It seems it varies from year to year. I never know.
* Being informed would be most important; to have some say in which issues should be addressed and the stance that the senate is going to take.
* Should be concerned with keeping excellent standards. We hired a lot of part-time teachers, without them having any knowledge of their subject matter. The students even told her this. They didn't even learn anything from teachers. Academic standards important. How classes are conducted. Support service. Students are entitled to a fair deal.
* To help me when I need the help.
* Just to be able to be accessible to me so that I can express a concern or have a voice to administration.
* Would like from Faculty Senate: I could go there and get answers to questions, could be a place for censer. A group that I would belong to. Don't expect it to be my lawyer or to take my side, just to be there. Sort of like my family or should be.
* Mostly an ear for problems to help clarify misunderstandings between administration and faculty; trying to be as objective as possible.
* Getting information from them about matters that concern the faculty, Giving us information from other colleges regarding faculty workloads; knowing what sort of faculty rights and responsibilities exist at other colleges; knowing how other colleges provide and maintain support for faculty.
* Keep me informed as to all the activities, the new things that are coming up.
* How about lobbying for us get some changes from state level on funding and pay rates. Increase funding for community colleges, get full credit for students that we serve.
* Keep us informed on state issues.
* Library may not need the type of help that faculty may have to face. We turn to departments for help. If there is a need for more communication, we would turn to individual departments.
* I don't really need help, and don't see it happening in the future when I would need help. They are extremely helpful to others who need help, but I don't know how I may need their help. To him, it's the small picture, the classroom, the students. The rest, he doesn't pay attention to it. The classroom, the students that's important. I don't have conflicts with anyone. It doesn't effect me.
* Don't have anything in particular in mind for me. Not anything in need at this particular time.
* I have no idea.
* The Senate has been very active.

QUESTION 3: What issues do you think are important?

* The main issue confronting us right now is a lack of honest interaction, real meaningful communication between faculty and administration that results in paranoia and innuendo. There are conflicting messages going in both directions. I don't know what's going on, (the story changes, because it depends on who you're talking to). Other issues could easily be dealt with if this issue could be handled.
* College needs to get a stable financial base. Have some leadership in the area of finance, and the way it's allocated throughout the school.
* Knowing how budget matters are decided and who decides where money goes. Faculty could be more involved in the budgeting process.
* Biggest issue--financing. Without that, no other issue would probably get done.
* Support services seem to be heavier than instructional services. Need to look at economic situation, where we spend our money.
* Cut-backs that are going on, and how to handle them.
* More budgetary priorities to classroom instruction, cutting back large classes, number of offerings. How much of the finances go into the classroom?
* Affirmative action issues.
* Making sure we have more full-time teachers instead of part-time teachers.
* Concerned about the number of part-time instructors that don't seem to be well qualified. They've just been thrown in there.
* Getting hiring procedure clarified and standardized so that we have a common process for part-time and full-time people.
* Involvement with more of faculty in decision-making priority in filling personnel needs in courses that are now taught by only part-timers.
* Appropriate hiring procedures. How each faculty member is chosen to be on a committee. The faculty should sit on different committees. Everyone should be involved, have a turn. Should be done objectively, systematically, should be guidelines, be impartial, done in a responsible, mature, unemotional way.
* Shared governance. Implementation of AB 1725.
* The way administration tends to deal in various problems is very important to me, and the administrative mechanism used in solving problems.
* The major issue is to have good administrative leadership, which the faculty has been looking for many years. Good leadership can lead to good hiring, good budget, scheduling, and curriculum decisions. Right now, the college is bounding, a yo-yo. Is not satisfied with direction college is heading because direction hasn't been laid out. College has a lot of good potential. Doesn't seem to have a clear vision administratively.
* Putting out rumors that are very destructive.
* Faculty input in the planning, decision-making process.
* Issues with board, administration versus faculty.
* Further enhance communication lines between administration and faculty. Creating a climate of cooperation between faculty and administration.
* To eliminate the sense of secrecy emanating from the administration. Another issue to be raised on campus as a whole-is to eliminate the sense that faculty has to cover--always be ready to defend themselves against administration. The faculty is on its own because it sounds like each faculty member could be

shot down by administration or students at any time.

* Administration should have more respect for faculty talents. We should have more of an accepted role. There are many highly educated people; they have both the education and experience, but rather than use their talents, administration often goes to consulting firms and pays ten times more for less education and experience.
* What frustrates me is that faculty is just as important as students and yet in reality from administration, they're not given their due respect. We always see it on memos how important administration perceives us, but when it comes down to issues and benefits, this importance disappears. You can understand how discouraging this can be for an instructor.
* Administration is too busy with their egos. The new food service center is one of the greatest insults the students have seen.
* Continue avidly polling all faculty and supporting faculty's needs, interests, and professionalism, especially to administration.
* Convince or show administration that CTA is our professional organization. Dr Allen says: "Faculty shouldn't list CTA as a professional organization."
* We have to start building structures/activities that give courage to the faculty to expand their ideas through interchange.
* We need to be really aware of our image within the body and to the outside. I hear from our faculty, especially in my department about negative stuff about Jr. College.
* Helping the institution to develop a more "open" management system.
* Faculty evaluation. Getting the AB 1725 issues that we have worked on with administration into the contract. The problem is: We don't have a system with the present agreement. We have to do what administration tells us. They are the final word. We have no due process unless those items are in the contract.
* Lift morale on campus.
* Create greater unity among faculty and all staff, and try to reduce fragmentation of staff at college.
* Faculty Senate should make a better effort in mentoring new teachers on campus. Deal with a lot of problems that new teachers have.
* Continue to work more closely with classified staff's association.
* We should have parking specially reserved for faculty as opposed to student parking. We need to do something about the workload for faculty members that are involved with Faculty Senate/CTA responsibilities. Need release time.
* Issue of how to get rid of our dead-beats, people who are or have become a liability.
* Need representation for Counseling Department as well as instructional faculty.
* Don't lose sight of what our function is--educate students, serving the student.
* Lacking in Faculty Senate is that we rarely discuss education, educational goals. We argue about other areas. We don't concentrate on what we do. Not that other things are not important, emphasis should be on education.
* I think that placing the responsibility of making these changes in the administration's hands is to place the responsibility in

the wrong hands. It really needs to be in the faculty's domain to make those recommendations.

* Managed growth. Faculty had to cut back on the number of students because of budget cutbacks and more students.
* Safety in school, safety in classrooms, concerned with having enough time to give to the students. I don't feel we are allowed enough time because you have to be with committees, and it takes away from students to be able to communicate with peers.
* I want to have academic freedom. I don't, however, with the type of students we have. They complain about the slightest things, and I find it difficult to teach effectively.
* Student conduct deteriorating--what Faculty Senate has to do with this--I'm not sure. Get along with administrative brethren.
* Course offerings, curriculum, selection of faculty members, disciplinary actions on the campus, staff development projects, support in extra curricular activities for students on campus: clubs, drama, music, etc.
* We need to have a faculty-based, long-term steering committee for the integration of technology in the instructional environment. We need a lot of changes in our instructional environment, and administration is not aware of what these changes are.
* Make full use of our facilities especially in the afternoon.
* It has to do with basically things like class size, equipment, what any teacher would say--books, lab,
* Better classroom facilities, working conditions and contract issues are very important,
* Lack of adequate tools and equipment to do an adequate job. There is a lot of new technology out there that we don't have. It would come about if there is more funding.
* Underfunded library, especially in the periodical section. We are in desperate need of a library for our campus with room for up-to-date material and office space for a librarian.
* Legal issues are important, anything that would cause me to follow or not follow the law--regulations.
* The demographic changes, issues of equity and access as a community college more so than other educational systems. We have an obligation to be sensitive to the needs of the community's economic needs, educational needs.
* We need more of a connection between senate representatives and rest of faculty.
* Need to negotiate a resolution to solve the conflict between flex and professional growth.
* Area of fringe benefits: Better medical coverage, dental, vision would be of some benefit to faculty. We are grossly unrepresented there. Roadblock is administration, not Faculty Senate.
* Maintaining livable salary levels, stop infringements on academic freedoms.
* Salary load percentages for class, class size, budget and facilities.
* The issues have to do with the rights of the faculty, from hiring procedures to health benefits, curriculum decisions, budget allocation.
* Freedom of information, free-flow of information. Everyone should be aware of everything: Budget, salaries, benefits, harmony, atmosphere of campus.
* Equivalency issue and instructional content are important.
* Faculty hiring--entire process thereof--anything that has to do

with college environment that affects the faculty as well as students needs, such as safety. Adequate classified support for faculty for instructional means. Hiring classified was not related to instruction previously.

* Fairness in hiring and promotion.
* Address favoritism on campus. We have seen too many people get promoted because of favoritism. This has greatly decreased morale on campus.
* Running department should be between administration and each department, not between other people outside of department (i.e. curriculum, all the other people that get involved to get things approved).
* I'm still unclear what their role is. I would like information, leadership on generic things, such as our load, responsibilities outside the classroom, and office hours.

QUESTION 4: What would it take to get you more involved with faculty issues or are you as involved as you want to be?

* I'm involved as I want to be:
* I'm happy as long as there is leadership to present a good image of faculty.
* My position is one that many people find themselves in--I am very busy. There are a lot of issues confronting us but with our time constraints and teaching schedules, we cannot get involved as we want. There is a desire but not the time.
* Overwhelmed in job duties.
* I don't have any extra time over and above my workload.
* Very active in past years, less so now because of other commitments.
* Would like to get back in the hierarchy of it as I once was if I wasn't as involved in teaching.
* Was a representative last semester; don't have time for more involvement. If Faculty Senate felt that administration were more trustworthy, faculty involvement wouldn't be so necessary, we could attend to our teaching jobs.
* Under present leadership, I am as involved as I want to be. I would be more involved if there was a change in present leadership--a split in Senate and CTA leadership. Should not be under the same leadership. We have a compounding in leadership. We need new blood because we have leaders in there that have been there since year one.
* People would get involved if there was controversy.
* No one shares with us what they are discussing. The Faculty Senate is not trusted because they are not spreading info on what they discuss. It seems secret. At least in appearance. The meetings are open to public, but no one goes. I am somewhat involved. Representatives not reporting back to the people they represent. They represent departments and they don't know how the individuals (departments) want them to vote. There doesn't seem to be enough communication, feed-back going on.
* Thoroughly involved already.
* Probably will be involved again.
* Would like to see more unity.
* If I thought administration was listening to Faculty Senate, and if Faculty Senate were willing to take the measures necessary to force attention.
* Co-teaching between issues and being more involved. Involvement is an issue and how to get it going I'm not sure. One way to get more involved is if they feel they can effect certain changes.
* Would like to be informed before getting involved. 1% raise. No one sharing it with faculty members--info about negotiations.
* I would appreciate more information and more say in what is done.
* If others became more involved, I would too. Need to expand participation in our faculty.
* Salary of $200,000 a year to conduct senate and assoc. business. and full release time would make him consider putting in more time.
* I would need to have release time and/or clerical help. Definitely need clerical help to be available for more faculty input.
* If I add another eight hours to my day.
* I don't have time because I'm still going to school but when it's over, I want to be more involved.

* I would love to become more involved with faculty issues. I would love to attend Faculty Senate meetings but it is during my laboratory time. I'm scared that if I attend these meetings, administration would come after me saying that I left my job for the meetings.
* I wouldn't mind being more involved. However, meetings seem to coincide with class schedule, making it difficult to attend. Constant reminder when meetings occur would be helpful. Schedule advisory. Maybe it's being done, maybe not. Does not read everything that comes through.
* Would like to be more involved but workload schedule makes it hard--coaching football, other commitments. Meetings are at times when I can't be available. My schedule is booked up in afternoons. Frustrating on my part because I can't be involved even if I want to be.
* Haven't been as involved as I want to be. Presently started to do that. Went to last meeting and saw that it's a good idea that I be there.
* I would very much like to attend the meetings, but can't because of schedule--not possible.
* I'd like to get more involved if I had the time.
* Would like to be involved when circumstances in my life allow it. When the time comes it will be my decision to get more involved.
* Not as involved as I would like to be. When you're new, everything is a trial. First commitment is to teaching.
* I would like to get more involved but I don't know how.
* Am very involved personally by getting up/giving input, being a chair, and reading materials that come through. I could be a little more involved personally if the senate meeting was at a time when I could come. If they met at 12:00 on Friday, I could come more frequently.
* As department chair, I'm pretty involved. I would get involved in the Faculty Senate if I knew what their specific purpose was,
* It feels like there is an actual concern instead of being superficial. More money to be more involved. Recognition for all people up there who are doing well may get him more involved. That would probably have to come from administration instead of faculty because they are the leaders. I would like to do quite a bit more for the faculty but all of us have a limitation of time and responsibilities. I feel I'm doing what I can. I'd like to do more, I really would.
* I would get more involved if it had to do with education. Less politics. Union is in a position to take care of politics. There is an adversarial relationship that continues after CTA. Should separate the issues. Leadership needs to rethink itself. What our role should be in terms of supporting instruction.
* I'm not seeking it out anymore. I will certainly support any of their decisions.
* Already on five different committees now. More than my share.
* I don't have the time. So busy - works about 60 hrs a week. There are so many students to be seen, can't service the students now with the time I have.
* It has become so political, so removed from what I do on a regular basis.
* The time I spend on campus has to be carefully timed. I have a lot of outside activities that curtail my involvement any more than it is now.
* I'm not too involved now. I don't know if any issue would get me more involved, except when negotiations come along and then I'm behind the faculty 100% in all issues.

* Area rep goes to the meetings, but there is no feedback or communication from the rep. Will not be involved right now.
* People can feel that they're really affecting changes because the Faculty Senate is more than a body to consult with but has actual power.
* More general meetings. At the meetings, there would be two-way communication.
* No place for faculty to interact, no place to get together. It could be through a newsletter, cafeteria, dining room. It could be an easy way to get together.

QUESTION 5: Would you like a telephone call like this to keep you informed, or what would be best for you?

* Phone call is good.
* Would be excellent. Likes the survey.
* Would like to receive telephone calls.
* Telephone calls are better like this than paperwork. Does not like message manager.
* Great to keep updated on what's going on so we can participate.
* Great to facilitate communication because there is a lack of it.
* Would help.
* Would be acceptable.
* Okay-to keep us informed, to let us know what's going on.
* Okay-if something definitely pressing came up. A phone call would certainly be nice, appropriate for a major, important issue for support. Make effort to contact people when issues are important. Good for emergencies, to be informed.
* Good for people who don't come to meetings. Would be favorable to hear from someone.
* Fine- I welcome it, both on campus and off.
* Wonderful but frustrating to track people down.
* Prefer call than mail box information.
* Useful.
* A Visit, personal phone calls are better--too many memos. Always receiving memos, too many, in mailbox. When we do receive a visit or phone call, make contact about specific issues. When making a personal visit, discuss 2 or 3 specific issues that are on agenda. It is not necessary to put out regular memos or calls when there isn't anything to discuss.
* I'm pretty active so I keep well informed.
* No telephone call.
* No - receive 28 messages a day - hard to return them already. Written preferable.
* Would not like a telephone call.
* Don't need one more. I would rather have things in mailbox.
* Too cumbersome.
* Not always around.
* Doesn't always work.
* Not good.
* Not necessary.
* Not really. This would put a lot of pressure on people. There is no lack of communication. There is no need to contact him because he sees and talks to these people who are involved.
* Method of choice. Newsletter is what we should have.
* Distribute some sort of a weekly synopsis of what's going on, who you're meeting with, and what's being discussed.
* Info is important. Dissemination process like newsletter would stop rumors that circulate.
* Something written and communication with area rep to supplement that.
* Newsletter is a good place to start. Anyone who has questions can call. They would like to be informed before getting involved. 1% raise. No one sharing it with faculty members--info about negotiations.
* Once a month to start, every three weeks or how often it is needed.
* Would like a Faculty Senate and union newsletter. Separate letter for each organization. Let them run more separately than they are now.
* Organization is very informative.

* I read all memos.
* Keep us informed on a regular basis.
* For on-going event, memos are just fine, very informative.
* Informed with agenda and minutes.
* Sufficient to keep us informed.
* The information through mails--great.
* Well informed right now with minutes and memos
* Written communication is better than telephone calls. Printouts received occasionally are just fine.
* Very happy with what's coming to me.
* Faculty does stay informed. Attendance at Faculty Senate meetings as well as being informed through communications.
* Basically, the minutes we get, possible input from area representatives on how they are meeting with faculty--okay. Have area reps meet with faculty of each division.
* I know what's going on.
* Information regarding minutes of meetings getting out really good. Informational flow is much more helpful in recent years.
* I enjoy receiving the memos and the updates regarding faculty senate meetings.
* I don't read minutes mainly because I grab them on my way to work with many other papers. Considerable amount of paperwork. I'm not aware of most of the issues.
* Have faculty place in the "VVC'er" to highlight issues on the campus so that we can know very clearly what debates are going on.
* G.H. is doing a wonderful job with mail.
* Getting in touch with issues. Face-to-face communication great. A group of four people (small groups) getting together and reporting back to other faculty members.
* Any type of communication that I could have would improve. I try to read minutes.
* An open forum where ideas can be exchanged without retaliation.
* Would be nice to use the "E" mail system (electronic) to distribute messages, to network.
* Takes place on more and more campuses--they use electronic bulletin boards. You can find out what's going on by typing out on your computer terminal--eliminates paper costs. Voice mail not used that effectively--voice mail could be used for memos for more interaction with a voice on the phone, program memos for only certain phone numbers. Not certain but a good possibility.
* Too hard to catch us a lot of times. Would like a memorandum regarding stage of negotiations. Regarding Senate - would like to receive a memo regarding professional growth, flex shops, flex days.
* A visit, personal phone calls are better--too many memos. Always receiving memos, too many, in mailbox. When we do receive a visit or phone call, make contact about specific issues. When making a personal visit, discuss two or three specific issues that are on agenda. Whatever issues are important, make the effort to contact people. It is not necessary to put out regular memos or calls when there isn't anything to discuss.
* Office space, faculty parking areas, faculty access to computer facilities, electronic mail communication, as opposed to twice-daily trips to the mail boxes to check for paper.
* We talk all the time amongst ourselves. We are already communicating very well.
* Yes, sure, why not, face-to-face, a good idea.

* From time-to-time for a "hot or special issue."
* Something specific.
* If they have the time.
* Probably would be constructive.
* Would be a little bit more of a personal approach. Can pin faculty down this way. However, there may not be enough time to do this. Phone calls would be direct communication with a lot of faculty very quickly. It may not be possible.
* Occasionally, once in a while to check and see what's going on.
* Yes and no. Questioning whether I would be free to discuss my problems with the executive board. Will I be safe to discuss my issues? (Would it be taken against me?)
* More than anything I could find a way to get my concerns listened to. I would like to receive a call from an officer to get updates with what's happening.
* As long as she's giving the information to me, and it gets through, that's enough.
* I don't care. I would be happy to talk if they called, and could find me.
* If they feel it is necessary, I am always open to talk. Anyone who has questions can call.
* Once I come up with something, possibly.
* It would be a good idea to contact the people who aren't being heard from or seen on a regular basis.
* Spend the time getting in touch with the people who need to be contacted.
* No, not really, not necessary, not particularly.
* I'm very comfortable with that.
* They know my concerns.
* I'll call them. I'm in touch.
* They know where I'm at.
* I don't need a special call.
* If I have a problem, I run it by Gloria Henderson.
* I see Gloria, Dick Powell almost every day.
* I have access to the executive officers if I need to talk with them.
* I don't have any objection to this. Unless I have something to pass on, I don't see a need. I see the executive officers often.
* If I had a particular concern, I would take the initiative to contact the appropriate person.
* I feel pretty free to make a call. If I have a concern, I voice it. I get in touch.
* I usually go to them. They already make themselves available.
* No because we have a representative from counseling.
* I support what they are doing. They are very busy. They don't have the time to hold everyone's hand or to call me.
* It is up to the individual to approach the executive members themselves. Soliciting concerns would put more of a burden on them. They have enough to do.
* Not really. I don't have any concern that isn't normal.
* No, I don't think so. I get upset about issues.
* It would be nice to have a map and flowchart here to see where the Faculty Senate exists in relation to other departments. What power and how much authority do they have with respect to other departments/administration.